

REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on November 9, 2009 and is accompanied by a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-17, 25 and 26 were pending and were rejected. In view of the following, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-12, 15-17, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lisle et al. (US Patent No. 4,843,389, hereinafter "Lisle") in view of Katayama et al. (US Patent No. 6,260,051 and US Patent No. 5,550,541, hereinafter "Katayama") and in further view of Okada (US Patent No. 5,889,481) and Edberg (US Patent No. 5,873,111). Of these, claims 1, 6, and 11 are in independent form.

Applicant continues to believe that the cited references do not teach or suggest, either separately or in combination, a symbol table and a plurality of compression tables as claimed. However, in the spirit of furthering prosecution Applicant has amended the independent claims to further distinguish the claimed subject matter from the cited references. For example, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite "constructing the symbol table to contain a list of code points for a plurality of linguistic symbols used in a plurality of languages", "providing a plurality of compression tables for the plurality of languages", and for each code point in the symbol table, "sorting the plurality of compression tables for the plurality of languages" and "identifying a highest compression type for compressions in the plurality of compression tables..., wherein the identified highest compression type indicates the highest compression type, for the code point, in the plurality of compression tables for the plurality of languages." Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to review paragraphs [0023]-[0026] which discusses identifying a highest compression type and storing a tag to indicate said highest compression type for the code point, in one exemplary embodiment. As disclosed, a tag is stored in the symbol table to indicate the highest compression type for the symbol in all of a plurality of compression tables (pertaining to a plurality of languages), for example.

In contrast, the cited references do not disclose features related to sorting compression tables and identifying highest compression types where a tag is stored in a symbol table, as claimed. For example, the cited Lisle reference discloses text compression and expansion, for categorizing entries in a dictionary. The alleged symbol table (i.e., column 19, lines 36-59) is a three byte or a two byte dictionary upon which text compression is performed in which entries are arranged by a weighted frequency (see column 3, lines 34-47). Lisle does not teach that the cited dictionary contains a list of code points for a plurality of linguistic symbols used in a plurality of languages. Moreover, there is no suggestion of storing a tag for a code point in a symbol table to indicate a highest compression type as claimed. The Office Action alleges that column 15, lines 45-63 discloses identifying a highest compression type. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In this section of Lisle, Lisle discusses a collation order that assigns hierarchical sorting collation order. For example, special characters are sorted first followed by upper and lower case letters and numerals. Lisle states that "actual dictionary entries for each dictionary are thus collated first and sorted into the collation order." Sorting a bunch of entries as disclosed in Lisle is not identifying a "highest compression type" as claimed. Amended claim 1 explicitly recites that the identified highest compression type indicates the highest compression type, for the code point, in the plurality of compression tables for the plurality of languages. Lisle simply does not do this. The sorting in Lisle has nothing to do with a plurality of compression tables for a plurality of languages.

Moreover, the cited references also do not teach or suggest, either separately or in combination, storing a tag in a symbol table (that contains a list of code points for a plurality of linguistic symbols used in a plurality of languages) to indicate a highest compression type for a code point for a plurality of languages. For instance, the section of Edberg cited as allegedly teaching a tag associated with a code point makes no mention of compression types or a highest compression type for a plurality of languages. Instead, Edberg is related to a priority level of significance that pertains to whether a number comes before a letter, etc. Edberg is not related to compressions or determining a highest compression type as recited as in independent claim 1.

For at least these reasons Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references, either separately or in combination, and is in allowable form.

With respect to independent claim 6, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references at least do not teach or suggest “for each code point in the symbol table, sorting the plurality of compression tables for the plurality of languages to order the compressions in the plurality of compression tables and to identify a highest compression type for all of the compressions in the plurality of compression tables.” Moreover, the cited references also do not teach or suggest storing a tag in a symbol table for each code point indicative of said highest compression type. The cited references do not teach or suggest, either separately or in combination, a tag for a code point that is stored as a portion of a sort weight of the symbol where the sort weight of the symbol identified by the code point comprises a case weight value and the tag for each code point is stored as part of the case weight value for the code point.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 6 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references and is in allowable form.

With respect to amended independent claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references at least do not teach or suggest, either separately or in combination, “wherein the highest compression type indicates the highest compression type for all compressions in a plurality of compression tables relating to a plurality of languages.” The references also do not teach or suggest “performing a binary search through each of the plurality of compression tables... wherein the plurality of compression tables are searched in a descending order of compression types of the compression tables starting with a compression table having a compression type equal to said highest compression type for said first letter.” For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 11 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references and is in allowable form.

Further, Applicant submits that related dependent claims 2, 5, 7, 10, 12-17, and 25-26 are also in allowable form at least based on their relation to independent claims 1, 6, and 11, discussed above.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

By: 

Christopher J. Volkmann, Reg. No. 60,349
Westman, Champlin & Kelly, P.A.
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, MN 55402-3244

One Microsoft Way
Redmond, Washington 98052-6399
Phone: (425) 707-9382

CJV/abs